

A HAMILTONIAN LATTICE THEORY FOR HOMOGENEOUS CURVED SPACETIMES IN 2+1 DIMENSIONS *

A. Criscuolo and H. Waelbroeck

Instituto de Ciencias Nucleares, UNAM
Apdo. Postal 70-543, México, D.F., 04510 México.
e-mail: hwael@roxanne.nuclecu.unam.mx

Abstract

We propose an exact Hamiltonian lattice theory for (2+1)-dimensional spacetimes with homogeneous curvature. By gauging away the lattice we find a generalization of the “polygon representation” of (2+1)-dimensional gravity. We compute the holonomies of the Lorentz connection $\mathbf{A}_i = \omega_i^a \mathbf{L}_a + e_i^a \mathbf{K}_a$ and find that the cycle conditions are satisfied only in the limit $\Lambda \rightarrow 0$. This implies that, unlike in (2+1)-dimensional Einstein gravity, the connection $\mathbf{A}$ is not flat. If one modifies the theory by taking the cycle conditions as constraints, then one finds that the constraints algebra is first-class only if the Poisson bracket structure is deformed. This suggests that a finite theory of quantum gravity would require either a modified action including higher-order curvature terms, or a deformation of the commutator structure of the metric observables.

* This work is supported in part by CONACyT grant 400349-5-1714E and by the Association Générale pour la Coopération et le Développement (Belgium).

1. Introduction

The quest for a lattice version of geometrodynamics which might lead a discrete proposal for the small scale structure of spacetime has a long history. Landmarks include the proposal of Ponzano and Regge in $d = 3$ ^[1], and Penrose’s “spin networks” ^[2]. In this note we will focus our attention on Hamiltonian lattice theory, where time is continuous but *space* is discrete. Continuous-time Regge calculus was pioneered by Piran and Williams ^[3], and Friedmann and Jack ^[4], then developped into the “null-strut calculus” of Miller and Wheeler ^[5] – in these and other efforts, a common difficulty eventually limited the potential of Hamiltonian lattice theories both for numerical relativity and as fundamental theories for the small-scale structure problem.

The difficulty is that the lattice constraints, that are analogous to the diffeomorphism constraints of Einstein gravity, fail to form a closed algebra under the Poisson brackets: Since these constraints are the generators of translations in the continuum theory, one says that *curvature breaks the translation symmetry* in lattice gravity. According to this picture, lattice theories describe a patchwork of flat cells, so the curvature is concentrated at the lattice “bones”; the spacetime – and the value of the Einstein action – will then depend on the location of the lattice sites, so that one should not expect translation symmetry to hold.

This “symmetry breaking” poses serious problems. The counting of degrees of freedom differs from the continuum limit, as the “gauge” degrees of freedom become dynamical at finite lattice spacing. Also, since the symmetry breaking is very weak, the action is nearly constant along the quasi-“gauge orbits”, so in computer simulations the integrated

history diverges from the constraint surface, as integration errors accumulate.

An example of a lattice theory of geometrodynamics with first-class constraints is the exact lattice formulation of the (2+1)-dimensional gravity for universes with no continuous matter terms and zero cosmological constant [6]. In this case the Einstein equations imply that spacetime is flat, so it is not surprising that one can find a lattice theory with translation symmetry; the theory can be reduced to only topological degrees of freedom by fixing the translation symmetry [7], leading to a representation of spacetime as a *polygon* in Minkowski space [8], which provides a convenient framework for canonical quantization [9].

When the cosmological constant is non-zero, the (2+1)-dimensional theory with no continuous matter again has only topological degrees of freedom, so one hopes that an exact lattice theory can be found. A first attempt in this direction was based on a complex version of the flat lattice theory, where *reality conditions* encode the condition that makes curvature homogeneous [10]. In this way, the constraints are first-class by construction: we transposed the difficulty to that of finding reality conditions that commute with the constraints.

In this Letter, we present an extension of the exact lattice theory by introducing a curvature parameter $\Lambda \neq 0$, using only real variables. This requires introducing additional lattice variables to specify parallel-transport along links of the lattice; for geodesic links in de Sitter space, these are explicit functions of the corresponding link vectors. The bracket structure of the parallel-transport matrices and link vectors together forms a deformation of the Poincaré algebra.

The lattice is reduced by gauge fixing, to a “fundamental polygon”. This leaves six constraints which generate global $ISO(2,1)$ transformations. We examine the example of

the torus universe, where the homotopies of the de Sitter connection $A = \omega \cdot L + e \cdot K$ are computed explicitly.

The solution space of (2+1)-dimensional gravity with a cosmological constant is related to the moduli space of flat Lorentz connections, and this space is spanned by holonomies which satisfy the cycle conditions. In the case of the torus, we find that the cycle conditions are satisfied only to first order in Λ , so the connection A is not quite flat. This indicates that the solutions are homogeneous spacetimes which satisfy equations derived from the Einstein-Hilbert action plus extra terms of higher order in the curvature.

2. The Lattice Theory for $\Lambda = 0$

We begin by reviewing the original $\Lambda = 0$ theory [6]. The lattice variables are link vectors $E^a(ij)$ ($a = 0, 1, 2$) in Minkowski frames at each face (i), and $SO(2, 1)$ matrices $M^a_b(ij)$ for parallel-transport across a link from face (j) to face (i). The faces are denoted by lower-case latin letters ($i, j, k \dots$), and the vertices by upper-case letters ($I, J, K \dots$) [Figure 1]. These lattice variables have the following Dirac brackets

$$\{E^a(ij), E^b(ij)\} = \epsilon^{ab}_c E^c(ij), \quad (2.1)$$

$$\{E^a(ij), M^b_c(ij)\} = \epsilon^{ab}_d M^d_c(ij), \quad (2.2)$$

$$\{M^a_b(ij), M^c_d(ij)\} = 0. \quad (2.3)$$

The same variables can be seen from either side of a lattice link; this leads to the reflection conditions

$$E^a(ji) = -M^a_b(ji)E^b(ij), \quad (2.4)$$

$$M^a_b(ji) = (M^{-1}(ij))^a_b. \quad (2.5)$$

The brackets of variables associated to different links vanish, while for the reflected links one finds

$$\{E^a(ij), E^b(ji)\} = 0, \quad (2.6)$$

$$\{E^a(ij), M^b_c(ji)\} = -M^b_d(ij) \epsilon^{ad}_c. \quad (2.7)$$

The constraints are the face closure relations [Figure 1],

$$J^a(i) \equiv E^a(ij) + E^a(il) + \dots + E^a(in) \approx 0, \quad (2.8)$$

and the flatness conditions for parallel-transport around a lattice site,

$$P^a(I) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{ac}_b (\mathbf{M}(ij) \mathbf{M}(jk) \cdots \mathbf{M}(ni))^b_c \approx 0. \quad (2.9)$$

We denote the number of lattice faces by N_2 , the number of links by N_1 and the number of vertices by N_0 . The $3(N_0 + N_2)$ constraints (2.8 - 2.9) satisfy the Poincaré-type algebra

$$\{J^a(i), J^b(i)\} = \epsilon^{ab}_c J^c(i), \quad (2.10)$$

$$\{J^a(i), P^b(I)\} = \delta(i, I) \epsilon^{ab}_c P^c(I), \quad (2.11)$$

$$\{P^a(I), P^b(I)\} = 0, \quad (2.12)$$

where $\delta(i, I) = 1$ if the vertex I belongs to the face i and the constraint $P(I)$ is defined (as above) by following a counterclockwise loop around I beginning at the face i . If a clockwise loop is followed, $\delta(i, I) = -1$, and if $I \notin i$, then $\delta(i, I) = 0$.

The face closure conditions $\mathbf{J}(i)$ generate $SO(2, 1)$ transformations of all lattice variables with a Minkowski index in face i , and the flatness conditions $\mathbf{P}(I)$ generate translations of the lattice vertex:

$$\{J^a(i), E^b(ij)\} = \epsilon^{ab}_c E^c(ij), \quad (2.13)$$

$$\{\xi \cdot \mathbf{P}(I), E^b(ij)\} = -\xi^a. \quad (2.14)$$

As defined by the brackets and constraints above, this theory has $6N_1$ phase space degrees of freedom, minus $3N_0 + 3N_2$ constraints, which generate the same number of symmetries, so the number of observable degrees of freedom is

$$6(-N_0 + N_1 - N_2) = -6\chi = 12g - 12, \quad (2.15)$$

where χ is the Euler number of the genus g universe. This is also the dimension of the moduli space of flat Lorentz connections, which results from the Chern-Simons formulation of (2+1)-dimensional gravity ^[11,12].

3. Exact Lattice Gravity with $\Lambda \neq 0$

Straightforward attempts to introduce curvature in this lattice theory lead to the usual difficulty of Hamiltonian lattice geometrodynamics. One modifies the flatness conditions $P^a(I) \approx 0$ by adding to the right-hand side a non-zero term to reflect the homogeneous curvature, but then finds that the new constraints are first class only in the limit of zero curvature, $\Lambda \rightarrow 0$, or in the continuum limit $\|E\| \rightarrow 0$.

In this article we choose to avoid this difficulty by giving a different interpretation to the parallel-transport matrices $\mathbf{M}(ij)$. We will let $\mathbf{M}(ij)$ denote the parallel transport across the link (ij) *at a crossing point arbitrarily near the vertex I* , where j follows i on a counter-clockwise circle around I (we assume that the universe is orientable). Likewise, $\mathbf{M}(ji)$ will denote the reverse crossing but *near the vertex J* . We then introduce matrices to transport from a point of face i near the vertex J to a point of face i near I , $\mathbf{M}(IJ)$. By convention $\mathbf{M}(IJ)$ transports along a segment following the link ij on the side of face i , and vice-versa, $\mathbf{M}(JI)$ follows the same link in the opposite direction ($I \rightarrow J$) on the side of face j [Figure 2].

One has the following link-reflection relations.

$$E^a(ij) = -M_c^b(ij)M_b^{-1a}(JI)E^c(ji), \quad (3.1)$$

$$\mathbf{M}(ij) = \mathbf{M}(IJ)\mathbf{M}^{-1}(ji)\mathbf{M}(JI). \quad (3.2)$$

With these definitions, the parallel-transport around a vertex I is again trivial, since this is an arbitrarily small loop; thus, the translation constraints are, as before,

$$P^a(I) \equiv \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{ac}_b (\mathbf{M}(ij)\mathbf{M}(jk) \cdots \mathbf{M}(ni))^b_c \approx 0. \quad (3.3)$$

Since a lattice face is now a polygon in a curved spacetime, the vectors $\mathbf{E}(ij)$ do not necessarily satisfy face closure conditions. On the other hand, we do need constraints that generate $SO(2, 1)$ conditions and reduce to the face closure conditions as $\Lambda \rightarrow 0$. In order to write down the correct extension to $\Lambda \neq 0$, we consider how the structure group $SO(3, 1)$ (or $SO(2, 2)$) manifests itself on the lattice. If one considers geodesic segments in de Sitter space, the parallel-transport matrices are related to the displacements by

$$\mathbf{M}(IJ) = \exp\left(\sqrt{\Lambda}\mathbf{E}(ij) \cdot \epsilon\right), \quad (3.4)$$

where ϵ^a are the $SO(2, 1)$ generators, $(\epsilon^a)^b{}_c = \epsilon^{ab}{}_c$. One finds

$$\begin{aligned} \{M^a_b(IJ), M^c_d(IJ)\} &= \frac{\sin^2\left(\sqrt{\Lambda}\|E(ij)\|\right)}{\|E(ij)\|^2} (\epsilon_{db}{}^c E^a(ij) - \epsilon^{ac}{}_d E_b(ij)) \\ &+ \frac{\sin\left(\sqrt{\Lambda}\|E(ij)\|\right)\left(1 - \cos(\sqrt{\Lambda}\|E(ij)\|)\right)}{\|E(ij)\|^3} (E_b(ij) \delta_d^a E^c(ij) - \delta_b^c E_d(ij) E^a(ij)) \\ &+ \frac{\left(1 - \cos(\sqrt{\Lambda}\|E(ij)\|)\right)^2}{\|E(ij)\|^4} \left((\epsilon^a{}_{df} E^c + \epsilon^{ac}{}_f E_d) E_b E^f - (\epsilon_{bd}{}^f E^c + \epsilon_b{}^{cf} E_d) E_f E^a\right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

This leads to

$$\{P^a(IJ), P^b(IJ)\} = \mu \Lambda \epsilon^{ab}{}_c E^c(ij), \quad (3.6)$$

where

$$\mu = \frac{\sin^2\left(\sqrt{\Lambda}\|E(ij)\|\right)}{\Lambda\|E(ij)\|^2}. \quad (3.7)$$

One has also

$$\{E^a(ij), E^b(ij)\} = \epsilon^{ab}{}_c E^c(ij), \quad (3.8)$$

$$\{E^a(ij), P^b(IJ)\} = \epsilon^{ab}{}_c P^c(IJ), \quad (3.9)$$

so that $\mathbf{E}(ij)$ and $\mathbf{P}(IJ)$ satisfy a deformation of the Poincaré algebra with the deformation parameter Λ , where the $SO(2,1)$ generators are $\mathbf{E}(ij)$. This suggests using the same algebraic form of the $SO(2,1)$ constraints as for the flat case ($\Lambda = 0$), namely

$$J^a(i) \equiv E^a(ij) + E^a(il) + \cdots + E^a(in) \approx 0. \quad (3.10)$$

However, for $\Lambda \neq 0$ these relations do *not* imply that the link vectors represent closed lattice faces in some common frame, since one must consider the parallel-transport along links: Indeed, the integral of the tangent vector around face i is

$$\mathbf{C}(i) = \mathbf{E}(ij) + \mathbf{M}(IJ)\mathbf{E}(il) + \mathbf{M}(IJ)\mathbf{M}(JK)\mathbf{E}(in) \neq 0, \quad (3.11)$$

so the faces close only in the limit $\Lambda \rightarrow 0$, as $\mathbf{M}(IJ) \rightarrow \mathbf{1}$.

The curvature for face i is the product of parallel-transport matrices along the links of the face, e.g.

$$\mathbf{W}(i) = \mathbf{M}(IJ)\mathbf{M}(JK)\mathbf{M}(KI). \quad (3.12)$$

Expanding to second order in $\sqrt{\Lambda}$, one finds

$$W_b^a(i) \simeq \mathbf{1} + \frac{1}{2}\Lambda\epsilon_{bc}^a (\mathbf{E}(il) \wedge \mathbf{E}(ij) + \mathbf{E}(in) \wedge \mathbf{E}(ij) + \mathbf{E}(in) \wedge \mathbf{E}(il))^c, \quad (3.13)$$

where

$$(A \wedge B)^c = \epsilon_{ab}^c A^b B^a. \quad (3.14)$$

Thus, the curvature is proportional to the area vector of the lattice face, to first order in Λ .

The link reflection relations simplify if we take into account the proposed relations between $\mathbf{M}(IJ)$ and $\mathbf{E}(ij)$: since $\mathbf{M}(IJ)\mathbf{E}(ij) = \mathbf{E}(ij)$, one finds as before

$$E^a(ij) = -M_b^a(ij) E^b(ji), \quad (3.15)$$

$$\mathbf{M}(ij) = \mathbf{M}^{-1}(ji). \quad (3.16)$$

4. Physical Content: Reduction to the Fundamental Polygon

As we saw in Section 2, all but a finite number of the degrees of freedom are pure gauge (for $g \geq 2$ this number is $12g - 12$, for the torus it is equal to 4 ^[7]). This implies that one can impose gauge conditions to reduce the lattice structure to the so-called “fundamental polygon”. One proceeds as in ^[7]: by translating all lattice sites to a single point, one finds a reduced lattice with a single face, one vertex and $2g$ links, which represent basis elements of the fundamental group. This reduced lattice can be represented as a polygon with $4g$ edges identified in pairs. With the link-reflection relations, one finds that if the $2g$ links and matrices are denoted $\mathbf{E}(\mu)$ and $\mathbf{M}(\mu)$ ($\mu = 1, 2, \dots, 2g$), then the identified links are

$$\mathbf{E}(-\mu) = -\mathbf{M}^{-1}(\mu) \mathbf{E}(\mu). \quad (4.1)$$

Consider the example of the T^2 universe [Figure 3]. The polygon’s the edges are $\mathbf{E}(1)$ and $\mathbf{E}(2)$ and their identified partners are $\mathbf{E}(-1) = -\mathbf{M}^{-1}(1)\mathbf{E}(1)$, and $\mathbf{E}(-2)$.

The constraints which generate $SO(2, 1)$ transformations are

$$J^a \equiv (\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{M}^{-1}(1))^a_b E^b(1) + (\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{M}^{-1}(2))^a_b E^b(2) \approx 0, \quad (4.2)$$

and the translation constraints require that the parallel-transport around the vertex of the polygon is trivial ^[7].

$$P^a \equiv \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{ac}_b \left(\mathbf{M}(1) \mathbf{M}^{-1}(2) \mathbf{M}^{-1}(1) \mathbf{M}(2) \right)^b_c \approx 0. \quad (4.3)$$

One verifies that these constraints satisfy the algebra $ISO(2, 1)$,

$$\{J^a, J^b\} = \epsilon^{ab}{}_c J^c, \quad (4.4)$$

$$\{J^a, P^b\} = \epsilon^{ab}{}_c P^c, \quad (4.5)$$

$$\{P^a, P^b\} = 0. \quad (4.6)$$

The Hamiltonian is

$$H = N_a P^a \approx 0, \quad (4.7)$$

where N^a are the “lapse-shift” parameters. One has the dynamical equations

$$\dot{\mathbf{E}}(1) = (\mathbf{M}(2) - \mathbf{1})\mathbf{N}, \quad (4.8)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{E}}(2) = \mathbf{M}(2)(\mathbf{M}^{-1}(1) - \mathbf{1})\mathbf{N}, \quad (4.9)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{M}}(1) = 0, \quad (4.10)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{M}}(2) = 0. \quad (4.11)$$

Note that this theory is formally equivalent to the $\Lambda = 0$ case; the only change lies in the fact that instead of assuming that parallel-transport is trivial along an edge of the polygon, we are now assuming that it is given by the equivalent of the matrix $\mathbf{M}(IJ) = e^{(\sqrt{\Lambda}\mathbf{E}(ij) \cdot \epsilon)}$, e.g. by $e^{(\sqrt{\Lambda}\mathbf{E}(1) \cdot \epsilon)}$, etc.

In order to examine the relation between this theory and the Chern-Simons formulation of (2+1)-dimensional gravity, we consider the $SO(3,1)$ ($SO(2,2)$) connection

$$\mathbf{A} = \omega \cdot \mathbf{L} + \mathbf{e} \cdot \mathbf{K},$$

where e is the dreibein, ω the spin connection and $\{\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{K}\}$ are the generators of $SO(3,1)$ (or $SO(2,2)$):

$$[L^a, L^b] = \epsilon^{ab}{}_c L^c, \quad (4.12)$$

$$[L^a, K^b] = \epsilon^{ab}{}_c K^c, \quad (4.13)$$

$$[K^a, K^b] = \Lambda \epsilon^{ab}{}_c L^c. \quad (4.14)$$

The variables $\mathbf{E}(ij)$ and $\mathbf{M}(IJ)$ are related to the integrals of the spin connection and dreibein along the lattice links as follows ($s \in (0, 1)$)

$$E^a(ij) = \int_I^J N_b^a(s) e^b{}_i(s) ds^i, \quad (4.15)$$

$$N_b^a(s_0) =: e^{\int_I^{s_0} \omega_i^a(s) L_a ds^i} : \quad (4.16)$$

$$M_b^a(IJ) = N_b^a(s=1) =: e^{\int_I^J \omega_i^a(s) L_a ds^i} : \quad (4.17)$$

From these relations one may show that, with the correct ordering of the generators, the link-integrals of the connection $\mathbf{A}$ give rise to the Lorentz matrices

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(IJ) &= : e^{\int_I^J (\omega_i^a(s) L_a + e_i^a(s) K_a) ds^i} : \\ &= e^{\mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{K}} \mathbf{M}(IJ) \\ &= e^{\mathbf{E} \cdot (\mathbf{K} + \sqrt{\Lambda} \mathbf{L})} \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

Therefore, the integrals of $\mathbf{A}$ around two basis loops u, v of the torus are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(u) &= : e^{\oint (\omega_i^a(s) L_a + e_i^a(s) K_a) ds^i} : \\ &= e^{\mathbf{E}(1) \cdot (\mathbf{K} + \sqrt{\Lambda} \mathbf{L})} \mathbf{M}(2), \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

$$\rho(v) = e^{\mathbf{M}^{-1}(2) \mathbf{E}(2) \cdot (\mathbf{K} + \sqrt{\Lambda} \mathbf{L})} \mathbf{M}^{-1}(1). \quad (4.20)$$

Matrices which satisfy the cycle conditions can be identified with holonomies of a flat connection. Since (2+1)-dimensional gravity with $\Lambda \neq 0$ is related to a theory of flat

Lorentz connections, it is interesting to check whether the matrices $\rho(u), \rho(v)$ satisfy the cycle conditions

$$\rho(u) \rho(v) \rho^{-1}(u) \rho^{-1}(v) = \mathbf{1} \quad (4.21)$$

With the constraints, these conditions become

$$e^{\mathbf{E}(1) \cdot \mathcal{J}} e^{\mathbf{E}(2) \cdot \mathcal{J}} e^{-\mathbf{M}^{-1}(1) \cdot \mathbf{E}(1) \cdot \mathcal{J}} e^{-\mathbf{M}^{-1}(2) \cdot \mathbf{E}(2) \cdot \mathcal{J}} = \mathbf{1}, \quad (4.22)$$

where the operators

$$\mathcal{J} = \mathbf{K} + \sqrt{\Lambda} \mathbf{L} \quad (4.23)$$

satisfy the algebra

$$[J^a, J^b] = 2\sqrt{\Lambda} \epsilon^{ab}_c J^c. \quad (4.24)$$

In the limit $\sqrt{\Lambda} \rightarrow 0$, one can neglect the commutators of the exponential factors in (4.22), so the cycle conditions become

$$e^{(\mathbf{E}(1) + \mathbf{E}(2) - \mathbf{M}^{-1}(1) \cdot \mathbf{E}(1) - \mathbf{M}^{-1}(2) \cdot \mathbf{E}(2)) \cdot \mathcal{J}} \quad (4.25)$$

which holds as a consequence of the constraints $\mathbf{J} \approx 0$.

This is no longer true if one considers the commutators of the exponential factors in (4.21): the $SO(3, 1)$ cycle conditions are no longer satisfied, indicating that the spacetimes described by this theory are not solutions of Einstein's equations but rather of a different “gravity theory”, with corrections proportional to the curvature – this would be equivalent to adding higher-order terms to the Einstein–Hilbert action.

On the other hand, one may insist that the cycle conditions be satisfied and the theory be equivalent to a gauge theory of flat Lorentz connections, and take the cycle conditions (4.22) as constraints. The constraints $\mathbf{P} \approx 0$ must hold as well since the $SO(2, 1)$

connection does not have a curvature singularity at the vertex, so the cycle conditions turn out to substitute the constraints $\mathbf{J} \approx 0$. The new constraints can be considered to be a deformation $\mathbf{J}' \approx 0$, where $\mathbf{J}' = \mathbf{J} + (\sqrt{\Lambda} - \text{terms})$. The requirement that the deformed constraints $\mathbf{J}' \approx 0$ satisfy the closed (first-class) algebra $so(2, 1)$ requires deforming the brackets of the polygon variables. To first order in $\sqrt{\Lambda}$, one finds

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{J}' = \mathbf{J} + \sqrt{\Lambda} & \left(\mathbf{E}(1) \wedge \mathbf{E}(2) - \mathbf{E}(1) \wedge \mathbf{M}^{-1}(1)\mathbf{E}(1) \right. \\ & - \mathbf{E}(1) \wedge \mathbf{M}^{-1}(2)\mathbf{E}(2) - \mathbf{E}(2) \wedge \mathbf{M}^{-1}(1)\mathbf{E}(1) \\ & \left. - \mathbf{E}(2) \wedge \mathbf{M}^{-1}(2)\mathbf{E}(2) + \mathbf{M}^{-1}(1)\mathbf{E}(1) \wedge \mathbf{M}^{-1}(2)\mathbf{E}(2) \right) + O(\Lambda). \end{aligned} \quad (4.26)$$

These constraints have the algebra $so(2, 1)$ if one assumes the following deformation of the brackets of any two loop vectors $\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W}$ (e.g., $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{E}(1)$, $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{M}^{-1}(2)\mathbf{E}(2)$)

$$\{V^a, W^b\}_q = \{V^a, W^b\} + \frac{1}{2}(V^a W^b - V^b W^a). \quad (4.27)$$

In particular, one has the deformed brackets ($q = 1 + \sqrt{\Lambda}$)

$$\{E^a(1), E^b(1)\}_q = \epsilon^{ab}_c E^c(1), \quad (4.28)$$

$$\{E^a(1), E^b(2)\}_q = \frac{1}{2}(q-1)(E^a(1)E^b(2) - E^a(2)E^b(1)), \quad (4.29)$$

$$\{E^a(2), E^b(2)\}_q = \epsilon^{ab}_c E^c(2). \quad (4.30)$$

This implies that the lengths of the two basis loops of the torus no longer “commute”: with $l_\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sqrt{E^2(\alpha)}$, one has

$$\{l_1, l_2\} = \|\mathbf{E}(1) \wedge \mathbf{E}(2)\|. \quad (4.31)$$

$$= l_1 l_2 \sin(\theta). \quad (4.32)$$

Thus, if one insists that the classical phase space should correspond to the moduli space of flat $SO(3,1)$ connections, one finds that in the quantum theory the sizes of the two basis loops cannot be measured simultaneously: Eqn. (4.32) implies that the product of the uncertainties on the two lengths will be proportional to the expectation value of the area of the universe. The algebra (4.32) is related to the algebra of coordinates on the “quantum plane”, with $\mu - 1 = \frac{i\hbar}{2\pi} \sin(\theta)$ ^[13].

5. Discussion

This article follows up on a line of research which aims to achieve a discrete quantum gravity theory by deforming exact lattice versions of topological theories to introduce local curvature degrees of freedom.

In this article, we introduced an exact lattice theory with *homogeneous* curvature. Although this is still a long way from a lattice theory with inhomogeneous curvature, it shows that curvature does not necessarily break the translation symmetry in a lattice theory of geometry.

The variables $E(ij), M(ij)$ satisfy the same equations of motion as for $(2 + 1)$ -dimensional gravity with $\Lambda = 0$, so the theory is closely related to the Chern-Simons topological invariant with $G = ISO(2, 1)$. Our result, then, is that the moduli space of flat $ISO(2, 1)$ connections can be represented as a space of homogeneous *curved* spacetimes.

The first-order calculation suggests that it may be possible to construct the exact lattice version of the Chern-Simons theory for the homogeneous gauge groups by taking the cycle conditions as constraints and deforming the algebra so as to make these constraints first-class. The deformed brackets of the loop variables $\mathbf{E}(\mu)$ then lead to a non-trivial prediction of the quantum theory – that the underlying structure of space is not a smooth geometry but a deformation thereof, which appears to be related to the “quantum space” structures [13].

The programme, to construct lattice geometrodynamics with first class constraints, can proceed from here along two different lines: one can either insist that the lattice theory be a reduction of Einstein’s theory to a finite number of degrees of freedom and deform

the algebra of the finite displacements $\mathbf{E}(ij)$, or view the Einstein-Hilbert action as a low-curvature approximation of the large-scale effective action and let the lattice theory provide a prediction of the higher-order curvature corrections to the action.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Lou Kauffman and José Antonio Zapata for stimulating discussions that led to the reactivation of our efforts towards a Hamiltonian lattice version of geometrodynamics.

References

- [1] Ponzano G and Regge T 1968 *Semiclassical Limit of Racah Coefficients*, in *Spectroscopic and Group theoretical methods in physics*. Amsterdam: North Holland
- [2] Penrose, R. 1971 *Applications of Negative- dimensional Tensors*, in *Combinatorial Mathematics and its Applications*, ed. D J A Welsh (Academic Press)
- [3] Piran T and Williams R M 1986 *Phys. Rev. D* **33** 1622
- [4] Friedmann L and Jack I 1986 *J. Math. Phys* **27** 2973
- [5] Kheiferts A, Miller W A and Wheeler J A 1988 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 2042
- [6] Waelbroeck, H 1990 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **7** 751
- [7] Waelbroeck, H 1990 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64** 2222
- [8] Waelbroeck, H 1993 *Rev. Mex. Phys.* **39** 831; 1991 *Nucl. Phys. B* **364** 475
- [9] Waelbroeck, H and Zertuche, F 1994 *Phys. Rev. D* **50** 4966; *Phys. Rev. D* **50** 4982
- [10] Waelbroeck, H, Urrutia, L F and Zertuche F 1992 A lattice theory with curvature and exact translation symmetry, in *Proc. Sixth Marcel Grossman Meeting* (Singapore: World Scientific)
- [11] Witten E 1988 *Nucl. Phys. B* **311** 46
- [12] Nelson J, Regge T and Zertuche F 1990 *Nucl. Phys. B* **339** 516

- [13] Takhtajan L.A. 1990: *Lectures on Quantum Groups*, in: *Introduction on Quantum Group and Integrable Massive Models of Quantum Field Theory*. Edited by M. L. Ge and B. H. Zhao (Singapore: World Scientific)

Figure Captions

Figure 1. A two-dimensional lattice is locally embedded in Minkowski space. The embedding is specified by representing the edges of each face as link vectors in a frame at that face. For example, the link vector $\mathbf{E}(ij)$ (dark arrow) is defined in a frame at face i . Parallel-transport between frames at neighbouring faces is given by $SO(2, 1)$ matrices $\mathbf{M}(ij), \dots$. In particular $\mathbf{E}(ij) = -\mathbf{M}(ij)\mathbf{E}(ji)$.

Figure 2. For a two-dimensional lattice on a curved space, parallel-transport between different vertices of the same face is non-trivial. Despite this fact, one can still make use of the variables $\mathbf{E}(ij), \mathbf{M}(ij)$, if one assumes that they are expressed in local frames near the vertex I (j follows i on a counterclockwise loop around this vertex). To complete the specification of the connection on the lattice, we introduce matrices $\mathbf{M}(IJ)$ which define the parallel-transport from the local frame at vertex J , face i to vertex I , face i .

Figure 3. The torus can be described as a parallelogramme with opposite edges identified. In the “polygon representation”, the edges of the parallelogramme are represented as vectors in a Minkowski frame. However, in the case of (2+1)-dimensional gravity with a cosmological constant there is no reason to expect that the four vectors in Minkowski space should form a closed figure.